REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 3 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice, claims 22 and 23 have been added, and no claims have been amended. Hence, claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11-23 remain pending.

The Office Action of 4/6/07 rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hampel (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0117864). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

At the outset it should be noted that the present Office Action is incomplete as it fails to address each element of the claims at issue. As just one of many examples, each element of claim 1 is not addressed, but rather an unsupportable statement is included that identifies elements and suggests that hey are somehow disclosed on page 20 of the cited art. Office Action at p. 3. Of note, page 20 does not even discuss the element (element 4010) that the Office Action suggests provides a basis for anticipating various elements of the claim. As another example, each element of claim 12 has not been considered. For example, there is no discussion of the stepped up frequency in the Office Action, and Hampel fails to disclose, teach or suggest such. Various other elements of claims 1-21 are also not considered in the Office Action, rather the office action merely recites such without any discussion of how such elements are taught, disclosed or suggested by the cited art. If another Office Action is necessary, Applicant respectfully requests that the incompleteness of this action be addressed through consideration of all elements of the claims as demanded by the MPEP.

Applicant's claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, generating an output clock signal that has at least one clock cycle inserted into the source clock signal. This results in an ability to support an increased bandwidth of data when compared to the input clock as the overall frequency of the output clock is increased when compared with the input clock by insertion of the at least one extra clock cycle. See e.g., Application at p. 7, ll. 8-12; p. 12, ll. 25-30. In one exemplary situation, such an increase in overall clock frequency may be used to match a corresponding increase in data transmission bandwidth after encoding data. See e.g., Id. at p. 2, ll. 15-25.

At the outset, it should be noted that the cited art does not even recognize the problem solved by Applicant's invention as set forth in claim 1. In particular, as Applicant understands it, Hampel discloses an approach for transferring a particular bandwidth of data at an overall output clock frequency (in one clock domain) that is the same as the input clock frequency (in another clock domain). As the data may become skewed from the clock, Hampel phase shifts the output clock to match the data, but maintains the same frequency. See e.g., Hampel at pp. 6-8 and 20-21. As Applicant understands it, the memory transfer process disclosed by Hampel would not be benefited by a frequency change set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, it is of no surprise that Hampel fails to disclose, teach or suggest Applicant's claim 1.

The Office Action suggests that the aforementioned element of claim 1 is disclosed somewhere on page 20 of Hampel. Office Action at p. 3. Such is simply not the case. Rather, Hampel merely discloses "Phase blend logic 2530 [that] uses well known circuitry, which is therefore not described . . ." Hampel at p. 20, paragraph 253. The phase blend circuitry 2530 is apparently the same as phase blend circuitry 4010, however, Hampel is silent on this point. Hampel's disclosure citing "well known circuitry [, but] not described [circuitry]" coupled with timing diagrams showing the same overall frequency fails to anticipate Applicant's claim 1. See e.g., Hampel at Fig. 27 (noting the transfer bandwidth appears constant). Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claim 1.

Further, claims 2, 4-9, 10-11 and 22-23 properly depend from claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth in relation to claim 1 above. In addition, newly added claim 22 provides for a first bandwidth supported by the input clock and a second bandwidth supported by the output clock, with the second bandwidth being greater than the first. This is not taught, disclosed or suggested by Hampel. Accordingly, newly added claim 22 is allowable for at least this additional reason. Yet further, newly added claim 23 provides that the output clock exhibits an overall frequency that is greater than that of the source clock. This is not taught, disclosed or suggested by Hampel. Accordingly, newly added claim 23 is allowable for at least this additional reason

Independent claim 12 includes a limitation similar to that discussed above in relation to claim 1. Hence, claim 12 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above

in relation to claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance thereof. Further, as claims 13-21 properly depend from allowable claim 12, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of the aforementioned claims and allowance thereof.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Hence, an early allowance of all such claims is earnestly requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees under 37 CFR 1.136, to the deposit account of the assignee, Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 720-266-4728.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Mark Hamilton/

Douglas M. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,629

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633